

REMARKS

This is to acknowledge that all of the last-submitted claims were rejected in the above-identified Office Action, primarily in view of the cited Finseth published patent application. In this regard, it is noted that 4 of the 5 claims that were rejected as being anticipated in view of the Finseth reference have been cancelled, while the remaining claims of the application have been amended. These amended claims are believed to be allowable over the cited rejecting references, although an attempt has been made not to raise new issues.

Specifically, the claims have been rewritten so that Claims 36, 37, 41, and 42 are in independent form, while Claims 39 and 44 have been rewritten as subclaims of the amended independent Claims 36 and 41, respectively. Independent Claim 36 is directed to a receiving apparatus for receiving television signals. The apparatus has a storing unit which stores an internal user profile generated on the basis of an operation history of an operation unit, and an external user profile input from outside of the receiving apparatus. The external user profile is automatically deleted in accordance with a predetermined time period elapsing from a time when the external user profile was stored in the storing unit, but the internal user profile is not automatically deleted even if the predetermined time period has elapsed from the time when the internal user profile was stored in the storing unit.

Independent Claim 37 requires a similar apparatus wherein the automatic deletion of the external user profile is performed after a selection unit selects the external user profile and a searching unit searches the program corresponding to the selected external user profile, again while not automatically deleting the internal user profile stored in the storing unit even if the

selection unit selects the internal user profile and the searching unit searches the program corresponding to the selected internal user profile.

These above-characterized features of the present invention are not disclosed in any of the cited references of Finseth, Hendricks, Bedard and Perkins. Particularly, the Finseth reference discloses that "If the amount of memory becomes an issue, then less frequently received program attributes are discarded to make room for ad preference information" (Paragraph [0088] lines 18-24). However, as the Examiner states in the Office Action, this reference fails to disclose the automatic deletion of an external user profile in accordance with a predetermined time period elapsing from a time when the external user profile was stored in a storing unit, and it does not disclose the absence of an automatic deletion of an internal user profile even if the predetermined time period has elapsed from the time when the internal user profile was stored in the storing unit. Also, it fails to disclose automatically deleting the external user profile stored in the storing unit, after a selection unit selects the external user profile and a searching unit searches the program corresponding to the selected external user profile, again while not automatically deleting the internal user profile stored in the storing unit if the selection unit selects the internal user profile and the searching unit searches the program corresponding to the selected internal user profile, as clearly recited in the amended independent Claim 37. In this connection, it should be noted that the reference of Finseth reference deletes an operation history on a program basis, while the present invention manages separately the internal and external user profiles and effects deletion of the user profiles on the user profile basis. The cited Hendricks reference discloses "searching a program database consisting of abstracts of a multitude of programs" (Col 2 lines 42-48). However, this reference does not disclose the deletion of the

external user profile at a predetermined timing among the internal and external user profiles stored in a storing unit, as recited in each of the amended independent Claims 36 and 37. In this connection, it is noted that the Office Action does not rely on the disclosure of Hendricks to reject Claims 36 and 37. The Bedard reference discloses in column 6 lines 6-8 that "the viewer profile must continue to search for an entry 202 that is old enough to be removed from viewer profile array 200". This reference relates to deletion based on an operation history on a channel basis, while the present invention manages separately the internal and external user profiles and effects deletion of the user profiles on the user profile basis. The reference of Bedard therefore fails to disclose the deletion of the external user profile at a predetermined timing among the internal and external user profiles stored in a storing unit, as recited in each of the amended independent Claims 36 and 37. Furthermore, the Perkins reference discloses in column 13 lines 29-31 that "user profile are deleted as part of search engine cleanup process", and also describes in column 8 lines 57-60 that "The search engine periodically performs cleanup tasks, using server-side scripts to remove information from the Table of User Profiles that is no longer needed or has not been used in a specified amount of time". However, this reference also fails to disclose the deletion of an external user profile at a predetermined timing among the internal and external user profiles stored in a storing unit, as recited in each of the amended independent Claims 36 and 37.

Claims 41 and 42 are corresponding method claims of Claims 36 and 37, respectively, and have been now amended in the same manner as the amended Claims 36 and 37. The above-described discussion applied to the amended independent Claims 36 and 37 therefore is also applicable to the amended independent Claims 41 and 42.

In view of the foregoing, the cited references of Finseth, Hendricks, Bedard and Perkins, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose the present invention as presented in each of the amended independent Claims 36, 37, 41 and 42, nor in the claims that depend therefrom. Accordingly, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1429990v1